DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 844 SP 036 407

AUTHOR Bray, Jane
TITLE A Comparison of Teacher Concerns for the Nontraditional Student Teacher and the Traditional Student Teacher.
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 39p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Students; Check Lists; Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Education; Higher Education; *Nontraditional Students; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Concerns Checklist (Parsons and Fuller); *Teacher Concerns Theory (Fuller)

ABSTRACT

The rapid influx of nontraditional students is drastically altering the complexion of teacher preparation programs. The purpose of this study was to identify how the nontraditional student teacher compares to the traditional student teacher regarding concerns about elementary classroom teaching, and to recognize any differences in concerns about elementary classroom teaching among nontraditional students. For the purpose of this research, traditional students were defined as students 24 years of age and below, nontraditional students as students 25 years of age and above, and career switchers as students also 25 years of age and above. The sample for the study consisted of the 72 elementary education student teachers for East Stroudsburg University (Pennsylvania): 50 traditional and 22 nontraditional student teachers. Data were collected during the practicum sessions held at the university, using a data collection form on the first practicum session day, the Teacher Concerns Checklist instrument administered in pre- and post-student teaching situations, and an individual narrative completed in the middle of the semester. Findings from the study confirmed differences in the levels of self and task concerns between traditional and nontraditional student teachers, and suggested that cooperating teacher training sessions should emphasize the needs and differences of the various types of student teachers and provide training in diverse avenues for supervision of these students. Findings indicated that impact concerns were extreme throughout the student teaching semester, signifying a concern for the learning that occurs for students in elementary classrooms. The findings also suggested the need for inclusion of a management technique course and earlier, more extensive field experiences. Data tables, concern factors, and the ethnograph coded response are appended. (Contains 35 references.) (ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 844

A COMPARISON OF TEACHER CONCERNS FOR THE NONTRADITIONAL STUDENT TEACHER AND THE TRADITIONAL STUDENT TEACHER

Jane Bray, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor
East Stroudsburg University
Department of Early Childhood and Elementary Education

Stroud Hall
East Stroudsburg University
East Stroudsburg, PA 18301
(717) 424-3686
E-mail: jbray@esu.edu

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Bray

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP036407

Introduction

Nontraditional students are changing the complexion of college classrooms, student teaching populations, and the pattern for development of concerns for pre-service teachers at large. The population of student teachers in teacher preparation programs is no longer exclusively comprised of "young" or traditional students. The rapid influx of nontraditional students is drastically altering the complexion of teacher preparation programs.

Thus, the primary purpose for this study was to identify how the nontraditional student teacher compared to the traditional student teacher regarding their concerns about teaching in the elementary classroom. A secondary purpose was to recognize any differences in concerns about teaching in the elementary classroom within the subsets of students who constitute the category of nontraditional students.

This study accepted that teaching concerns exist for student teachers, but focused on the heterogeneity of the student teachers as a function of those concerns. The rapid increase of nontraditional students entering teacher preparation programs and ultimately the profession of teaching, provide the impetus for understanding the interaction of these two fields of development. "Put another way, efforts are in motion to learn more about the psychology of adulthood and the psychology of the growing teacher" (Cruickshank, Armaline, Reighart, Hoover, Stuck, & Traver, 1986, p. 354). Thus, research into teaching concerns for student teachers was refocused. This research considered the new variety of personal demographics for student teachers that contribute to the

heterogeneity of pre-service teachers rather than considering a homogeneous grouping of student teachers as in the past.

Theoretical Framework

Concerns about teaching influence students during the student teaching semester. There is a need to identify and present an avenue to resolve those concerns. Initially, research in the area of teacher concerns did not identify a specific type of concern, but rather focused on the realization that pre-service teachers may need further assistance and guidance during field experiences. This focus continued (Erickson & Ruud, 1967; Thompson, 1963; Travers, Rabinowitz, & Nemovicher, 1952) until Fuller (1969) began to label the stages for teacher concerns.

The concerns of student teachers, examined through the work of Fuller (Fuller, 1967; Fuller, 1969; Fuller & Case, 1972; Fuller & Parsons, 1972; Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1974) are the study of the developmental changes that occur in the teachers' concerns during the professional maturation process. "Concerns about teaching are expressions of felt need which probably possess motivation for relevant learning" (Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1974, p. 2). George (1974) continued to examine and extend Fuller's teaching concerns, as did Adams and Martray (1981), in order to describe the stages of concern as identified by Fuller (1969) with greater specificity and clarity following the initial design.

Fuller (1969) purposes the stages of self, task, and impact. The stage of self indicates a concern for personal performance in the classroom. Task indicates concerns regarding the process of being a teacher in the classroom. The impact stage represents a concern for the learning opportunities afforded to the students in that classroom.

When stages were attached to teacher concerns, other patterns developed through further research. Fuller (1969) believed that the stages were developmental in nature and one stage of concern needed to be resolved before the next stage could be attained. Most research for teacher concerns tested these stages and the developmental sequence of movement through the stages (Adams 1982; Adams, Hutchinson, & Martray, 1980; Adams & Martray, 1981; Cohen, 1982; George, 1978; Hynoski, 1988; Kazelskis & Reeves, 1987; Maxie, 1989). The results of these studies indicated that distinctions among the stages of concern were more than initially found by Fuller (1969) and differences were also identified for the development through the stages.

General indications supported the level of self concerns as identified by Fuller (Hynoski, 1988; Maxie, 1989; Pigge & Marso, 1987), but refuted the fact that one stage of concern needed to be resolved before reaching another stage (Adams et al., 1980; Fredericks, 1987; Kazelskis & Reeves, 1987; Maxie, 1989). The impact level revealed the greatest discrepancy in the research. Most studies reported a higher level of concern for impact concerns much sooner than the original model proposed (Adams et al., 1980; Cohen, 1982; Hynoski, 1988; Pigge & Marso, 1987; McCurdy, 1982).

However, despite the fact that Fuller's (1969) original stages of concern were tested and refuted, her research led to the development of an instrument designed to measure the stages of concern. The original work of Fuller (1969) became the basis for the Teacher Concerns Statement (TCS) (Fuller & Case, 1970). A second instrument known as the Teacher Concerns Checklist - Form B (TCC) emerged as an extension of the TCS. In addition, George (1974) and Adams et al. (1980) expanded on the distinctions for the

factors within the TCC. Finally, George (1978) was responsible for the Teacher Concerns Questionnaire (TCQ).

A primary purpose of this study was to utilize past research with the instruments designed to measure the stages of concern and determine the stages of concern among a group of student teachers with differing demographics. The vexing issue of nontraditional students dealing with concerns about teaching defined a new avenue for research into teaching concerns. The main question to be addressed was whether the concerns for teaching would differ as a function of the life-span development of an individual.

Life-span development theories observe stages of development (Erikson, 1950), eras (Levinson, 1986), ego (Loevinger, 1976), and external factors (Neugarten, 1977) that characterize adult development. When considering the life and career experiences of nontraditional students, the question remained as to how that background of knowledge and development would affect the stages of concern regarding teaching in a classroom. Only a handful of studies was able to draw comparisons between traditional and nontraditional student teachers (Cohen, 1982; Cohen & Klink, 1989; Marple, 1989; Hamilton, 1991).

Cohen (1982) and Marple (1989) reported that all student teachers exhibit some level of self concerns upon entering the student teaching experience. However, they also exhibited greater concerns for the impact stage. Also, nontraditional students with child rearing experience displayed fewer self concerns and moved to the task and impact stages of concern.

Utilizing all of the past research, an initial consideration was to test the stages of concern between traditional and nontraditional students before, during, and after the student teaching experience. An additional speculation was to provide an in-depth view of the concerns for all nontraditional students.

For the purpose of this research, traditional students were defined as students that were ages 24 and below and were enrolled in an elementary teacher preparation program. An appraisal of the group of nontraditional students suggested that this group was comprised of two subsets. The first was identified as older students. Older students were ages 25 and above and were enrolled in an elementary teacher preparation program. The second subset, identified as career switchers, were ages 25 and above and were enrolled in an elementary teacher preparation program. However, the career switchers had previously received a baccalaureate degree in another area of concentration, compared to the older students who would be receiving their first baccalaureate degree upon completion of the student teaching experience. Upon completion of the student teaching semester, the older students received a baccalaureate degree and a certificate to teach while the career switchers only received a certificate to teach.

The student teaching experience represents the preliminary step for the developing teacher. Although the traditional student teacher and the nontraditional student teacher represent various demographic profiles, both groups enter the same beginning stage for the process of becoming a teacher. Findings reveal that nontraditional students are different than traditional students in the higher education environment (Hensel, 1991;

Hollis & Houston, 1991; Post & Killian, 1992/1993). The differences for traditional and nontraditional students identified in the classroom warrant an exploration of the differences for these students during the student teaching experience.

Procedures

Participants

The sample for this study consisted of all of the elementary education student teachers for East Stroudsburg University, East Stroudsburg, PA. This sample totaled 72 elementary education student teachers at the end of the testing period, of whom 50 were identified as traditional student teachers and 22 were nontraditional student teachers. For the nontraditional subsets, nine of the students were classified as older students and 12 were identified as career switchers. All of the student teachers entered the student teaching semester in Fall 1993. The experimental mortality effect was identified for four of the participants in the study. Four students did not complete the testing for two reasons: (1) two students did not complete the student teaching semester due to failure, and (2) two students moved to their next student teaching assignment in their second major. The results of this study were considered utilizing the student teachers that completed the entire student teaching semester in elementary education (N = 72).

Prior to this experience all students had completed a limited number of classroom observational hours in their sophomore year. In addition, all of the student teachers had two weeks in the classroom for early field experiences and had also met the requirements imposed by the university to be accepted for the student teaching semester.

All of the student teachers were evaluated utilizing a Pass/Fail system from the university. In addition, all of the student teachers received one primary experience and one middle level experience for their student teaching assignments. Each student teacher had two different cooperating teachers and one university supervisor assigned to them for the semester. All of the student teachers attended large group practicum sessions to enhance and support their experiences in the field. Finally, all of the student teachers completed identical requirements that were required to advance through the student teaching semester.

Data Collection

All of the data collections were conducted during the practicum sessions held at the university. Only one professor from the university was responsible for administering the instruments.

A data collection form was administered to the students on the first practicum session day. The primary purpose of this form was to collect demographic information about the students and to utilize this information to separate the students into the traditional or nontraditional groupings. The demographic information that was collected consisted of age, gender, grade point average (GPA), marital status, number of children, grade level assignment, and intentions to remain in the teaching profession.

The mean age for the traditional students was 22.19 while the mean age for the nontraditional students was 33.66. Only 10 percent of the traditional students teachers were males and eight percent of the nontraditional student teachers were males.

The traditional student teachers had a mean GPA of 3.01 with a standard deviation of 0.380. The nontraditional student teachers had a mean GPA of 3.40 with a standard deviation of 0.551. Four of the traditional student teachers were married compared to 13 of the nontraditional student teachers. Nine of the nontraditional student teachers had children while only two of the traditional students were parents.

The TCC instrument was administered in a pre- and post-student teaching situation. The first TCC was administered directly before the students entered the first student teaching experience and the second was administered directly upon completion of the final student teaching experience. The TCC was an instrument designed to measure teacher concerns and was based on the three stages of concern; self, task, and impact concerns. The student teachers responded to their concerns about teaching with the following statement in mind "When I think about my teaching, how much am I concerned about this" (George, Borich, & Fuller, 1974, p. 1 of checklist)? The initial information on the checklist defined "concerned" for the student teacher as being "if you think about it frequently and would like to do something about it personally" (George, Borich, & Fuller, 1974, p. 1 of checklist). Some sample statements from the checklist include "challenging unmotivated students," "feeling under pressure too much of the time," "where I stand as a teacher," and "helping students to value learning" (George, Borich, & Fuller, 1974, p. 1, 2, & 3 of checklist). The levels of response on the Likert scale for these statements were: (A) Not concerned, (B) A little concerned, (C) Moderately concerned, (D) Very concerned, and (E) Extremely concerned.

Schipull (1990) tested the reliability and validity of the TCC. After conducting a factor analysis, the reliability of the TCC was examined by using a test-retest analysis and Cronbach's coefficient alpha (Schipull, 1990). The validity was examined by calculating Pearson product moment correlations between the TCC and the Quality of Teacher Work Life Survey and the Teacher Stress Inventory (Schipull, 1990). Schipull (1990) concluded that the results indicated the reliability and validity of the TCC were sufficient for use in educational research.

A recent study conducted by Lamanna (1993) confirmed the findings of Schipull (1990). Using a confirmatory factor analysis with the TCC and a national sample of in-service teachers, Lamanna (1993) supported the Schipull (1990) study.

Finally, during the middle of the student teaching semester, the student teachers were asked to respond in a narrative format to identify their concerns about teaching. Concerns were defined in the same manner as on the explanation that accompanies the TCC. This administration was also conducted in the same location and fashion as with the other data collections.

Data Analysis

Two sets of factors were utilized to analyze the results from the TCC instrument that were administered in a pre- and post-situation. The first set of factors was constructed following the guidelines identified by George (1974) and the second set of factors was identified by Adams et al. (1980) (See Appendix A). The analysis was conducted using each of these sets of factors to determine the differences between the traditional and nontraditional student teachers. The analysis was conducted in the same manner to

identify the differences in the scores on the TCC between the two subsets of nontraditional student teachers.

The transformation of data was conducted by calculating a mean for each TCC item under each factor identified by George (1974) and by Adams et al. (1980). A mean of means was calculated for all of the items within each factor in order to conduct the analysis. To determine the differences in the pretest scores between the groups of student teachers a *t*-test procedure was utilized. *T*-tests were also utilized to determine the differences in the posttest scores for the groups of student teachers.

A repeated measures analysis of variance was utilized to determine the interaction of the groups of student teachers and the time effect of the student teaching semester. This model was able to effectively incorporate the group effect and the time effect that was of interest to the researcher.

A Pearson Product Moment correlation was applied to the demographic variable of GPA for a correlation with the factors of concern. The additional demographic variables were observed for possible influence over the stages of concern using the mean, the standard deviation, and the standard error.

The computer program Ethnograph was used when analyzing the narrative responses that were collected during the middle of the student teaching semester. This program enabled the user to supply key codes or identifiers from the TCC format and apply those to the narrative responses. For the purpose of this content analysis, the statements that corresponded with the factors of George (1974) and Adams et al. (1980) were entered into the program. The preparation involved typing in the coding information and

numbering the program which means that the programmer attached consecutive coding and numbering to each line of the student response form (see Appendix B for a coded response).

Results

The results of the TCC administered at the beginning of the student teaching semester indicated that the traditional student teachers entered the student teaching semester with higher levels of concern than the nontraditional student teachers. Both groups had higher levels of concern regarding the self and impact factors than the task factor. The level of task concerns was the lowest for both groups of student teachers.

However, the results of the *t*-tests indicated that task concerns under George (1974) [$t(74) = 2.01$, $p < .05$], and task concerns as related to instruction under Adams et al. (1980) [$t(74) = 2.39$, $p < .01$], were statistically significant for the traditional and nontraditional student teachers for the first administration of the TCC.

The nontraditional students classified as older students experienced lower levels of concern for all of the factors under George (1974) and Adams et al. (1980) than the career switchers for the pretest of the TCC. Although the factors under Adams et al. (1980) were more definitive, both groups experienced more concerns about self and impact than task concerns. However, task concerns as related to discipline surfaced as a higher level of concern for the career switchers. The results of the *t*-test for the nontraditional subsets of student teachers identified only task concerns under George (1974) as statistically significant for the first administration of the TCC [$t(21) = 2.14$, $p < .05$].

The narrative response collected during the middle of the student teaching semester uncovered serious concerns regarding classroom discipline that were connected to the grade assignments of the student teachers. In addition, the TCC items identified under the George (1974) factors that were identified on the narrative response suggested that the student teachers experienced self and impact concerns, while the TCC items under the Adams et al. (1980) factors indicated task and impact concerns.

The narrative responses also included stray factors that were labeled as additional factors of concern for the student teachers. The strongest additional factors suggested a variety of major concerns about the cooperating teacher and the lack of classroom experience for the student teachers.

The traditional student teachers continued with higher levels of concern for all of the factors than the nontraditional student teachers for the post-administration of the TCC. The traditional student teachers had higher self and impact concerns compared to the nontraditional student teachers who had higher impact concerns.

The t-tests at the post-administration of the TCC identified self concerns under George (1974) [$t(70) = 2.12$, $p < .05$] and self concerns as related to adult perceptions under Adams et al. (1980) [$t(70) = 2.15$, $p < .05$] as the only factors that were statistically significant for the traditional and nontraditional student teachers. The nontraditional students were less concerned about their interactions with adults already in the profession, but also in the same age category, than the traditional students interacting with adults of another age category.

The nontraditional subsets of student teachers completed the student teaching semester with higher levels of impact concerns than self or task concerns. However, the older student teachers had lower levels for all concerns under George (1974) and Adams et al. factors when compared to the concerns of the career switchers. The *t*-test results for the post-administrations of the TCC for the nontraditional subsets of student teachers did not identify any factors for George (1974) or Adams et al. (1980) as statistically significant.

The ANOVA results marked a significant difference for the Adams et al. (1980) task factor as related to instruction and for the George (1974) self and task factors for the traditional and nontraditional student teachers (See Table 1). In addition, there was a significant time effect for the self factor under George (1974) and for the self factor as related to adult perceptions under Adams et al. (1980) for the traditional and nontraditional student teachers (See Table 2). No interaction effects were observed for the traditional and nontraditional student teachers.

There were no significant group differences for the nontraditional subsets of student teachers. There were only time effects for the self factor under George (1974) (See Table 3) and the self factor as related to adult perceptions under Adams et al. (1980) (See Table 4). No interaction effects were observed for the subsets of nontraditional student teachers.

These findings support the past research of Fuller (1969) and Cohen (1982) which recognized that self concerns diminished over the course of the semester for all student teachers. Unlike the Marple (1989) study which recognized that "the rate of reduction

was varied," the significant time effect identified for this factor did not support a varied reduction rate for self concerns with the George (1974) factors (p. 171). Not surprisingly however, the traditional student teachers were not as self confident as the nontraditional student teachers and will not be likely to gain this level of confidence before beginning their first teaching experience. Also, the career switchers were not as confident as the older students despite the similarities in age.

The correlation of demographic variables did not indicate a significant difference in the levels of concern over the course of the entire student teaching semester. Although the GPA, gender, and marital status were related to the results of the pretest administration of the TCC, these differences diminished over the course of the student teaching semester. However, the demographic variable of grade level assignment was related to concerns about classroom management.

Discussion

This study was conducted to identify the changes in teaching concerns over the student teaching semester for traditional and nontraditional student teachers. In addition, the concerns for the nontraditional subsets of student teachers was examined. Finally, the life-span development of the individual and personal demographic variables were correlated with the levels of concern during student teaching.

Research indicates that the student teaching semester represents a critical component in any teacher preparation program. In order to maximize the influence of this semester, teacher educators should recognize the levels of concern with student teachers and focus on constructing models for the resolution of teaching concerns. Although this research

was conducted to identify the arousal of concerns, the implications suggest areas that could encourage a resolution of concerns.

Differences for concerns were clearly identified for the traditional and nontraditional student teachers and only tentatively suggested for the nontraditional subsets of student teachers. Since differences were perceived between the traditional and nontraditional student teachers, teacher preparation programs should question whether or not to consider a format such as an Individual Education Plan to guide the nontraditional students through practical classroom experiences. This opens a discussion regarding the suggestion to examine if student teachers with differing personal variables benefit to the fullest extent by meeting identical requirements during the student teaching semester as imposed by this university.

The nontraditional subsets of student teachers were in the same age category. Nonetheless, the career switchers experienced greater concerns than the older students. What does this suggest for the subsets of nontraditional students? Perhaps the certification programs at the university are lacking when compared to the four year teacher preparation programs. Educators need to question whether older students experiencing college for the first time are better prepared to teach than career switchers.

These questions for the nontraditional subsets of student teachers cannot be satisfied within this study considering the small sample size for the subsets of nontraditional student teachers. Nonetheless, serious doubts about the similarities between the subset of nontraditional students cannot be ignored for future research. The consistently higher levels of concern for career switchers as compared to older students implies that the

completion of a baccalaureate program in another discipline for the career switchers plus the certification program, did not prepare these students for teaching in the same manner as the older students.

The developmental patterns for the levels of concern should be an impetus to strengthen existing teacher preparation programs. Therefore, teacher education programs should focus on the pattern that exists for the levels of concern over the student teaching semester to be truly effective. Initial programs could focus on resolving concerns about self and simultaneously provide programs that focus on optimal learning for the students in an elementary classroom and an appreciation for learning within that classroom.

Differences in the levels of self and task concerns were confirmed in this study. This information could be utilized to enhance the practicum sessions offered by the university. Teacher educators need to share this information with all professionals that operate within the student teaching semester. The cooperating school district and individual cooperating teachers would be able to better prepare the future professional if cognizant of the differences in the levels of concern. Cooperating teacher training sessions should emphasize the needs and differences for the various types of student teachers and provide training in diverse avenues for supervision of these students.

In addition to the difference in self and task concerns, the findings of this study indicate that impact concerns were extreme throughout the student teaching semester. These findings signify a concern for the learning that occurs for students in elementary classrooms and can be viewed as positive directions for future educators. Deliberate

efforts need to be considered to examine the level of impact concerns through dialogue and professional development presentations and focus on specific techniques for individual student growth in the elementary classroom.

The study recognized the concern for classroom management as an item that did not abate nor was it resolved over the course of the semester. To truly maximize teaching potential in the classroom, management concerns need to diminish or resolve in order for the student teacher to effectively learn to teach. The inclusion of a management technique course would offer methods for direct classroom usage. In addition, training programs that address current social problems that influence the classroom would benefit the student teachers as they progress through the field experience.

The additional factors that were discovered through the course of this research indicated an area for improvement in teacher preparation programs. Restructuring teacher preparation programs to allow for additional early field experiences should be developed with these findings in mind. Student teachers are deficient in their preparation if allowed to enter the student teaching experience harboring basic concerns such as unfamiliarity with the grade level. The inclusion of more extensive field experiences established earlier in the elementary education program should concentrate on offering a variety of classroom settings. In addition, student teachers should be encouraged to observe in various classroom settings within their school during the actual student teaching experience. Assignments or focused objectives for grade level exposure would guide the observations to resolve concerns for the student teachers. The extensive

grade level and teaching style exposure would enhance professional development for the student teacher.

The additional concern about the cooperating teacher also needs consideration. The concern for feedback from the cooperating teacher was a major problem for the student teachers. Teacher preparation programs need to reconsider the existing methods for assigning cooperating teachers and also contemplate methods for continuous training for cooperating teachers. These considerations in conjunction with new cooperating teacher training sessions could provide methods for the support that the student teachers perceive as lacking in this program.

With strong indications that nontraditional students will increase in teacher preparation programs, their presence will also influence the profession of teaching. Such an influx of individuals must be recognized and advanced through the profession in the most constructive method for the benefit of the students in the elementary classroom. Recognizing the difference in concerns, administering to the concerns, and finally resolving the concerns will strengthen the individual teacher for the ultimate benefit of the future of education in the elementary classroom. An awareness of this process is unmistakably a responsibility for all involved in teacher preparation.

REFERENCES

Adams, R. (1982). Teacher development: A look at changes in teacher perceptions and behavior across time. Journal of Teacher Education, 33,(4), 40-43.

Adams, R., Hutchinson, S., & Martray, C. (1980, April). A developmental study of teacher concerns across time. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 189 181).

Adams, R., & Martray, C. (1981, April). Teacher development: A study of factors related to teacher concerns for pre, beginning, and experienced teachers. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 200 591).

Cohen, M. (1982, March). Teacher career development: A comparison of college-aged and older-adult preservice teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 255 519).

Cohen, M., & Klink, B. (1989, March). Career development: A longitudinal study of teachers at different life-stages. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 307 247).

Cruickshank, D., Armaline, W., Reighart, P., Hoover, R., Stuck, A., & Traver, R. (1986). As teachers mature. The Clearing House, 59, 354-358.

Erickson, J., & Ruud, J. (1967). Concerns of home economics students preceding their student teaching experiences. Journal of Home Economics, 59, 732-734.

Erikson, E. (1950). Childhood and society. New York: Norton.

Fredericks, T. (1987). The concerns of graduate student teachers: A developmental conceptualization. (Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1987).

Fuller, F. (1967). Intensive individualization of teacher preparation. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Texas University, Austin, TX. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 011 603).

Fuller, F. (1967). Behavioral science foundation for elementary education: Course content ordered by empirically derived concerns sequence of prospective teachers. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Texas University, Austin, TX. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 058 176).

Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6(2), 207-226.

Fuller, F., & Case, C. (1972). A manual for scoring the teacher concerns statement. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Texas University, Austin, TX. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 079 361).

Fuller, F., & Parsons, J. (1972, April). Current research on concerns of teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Il. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 063 257).

Fuller, F., Parsons, J., & Watkins, J. (1974). Concerns of teachers: Research and Reconceptualization. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Texas University, Austin, TX. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 091 439).

George, A. (1974). Analysis of five hypothesized factors on the teacher concerns checklist, form B. University of Texas, Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

George, A. (1978). Measuring self, task, and impact concerns: A manual for the use of the teacher concerns questionnaire. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Texas University, Austin, TX. (Listed in the ERIC Document Service No. ED 175 845).

George, A., Borich, G., & Fuller, F. (1974). Progress report on the teacher concerns checklist. (Report No. 2326. Austin: The University of Texas, Research and Development center for Teacher Education.

Hamilton, R. (1991). Personal variables affecting experiences of nontraditional aged student teachers. (Doctoral Dissertation, Colorado State University, 1991).

Hensel, N. (1991). Accommodating the needs of adults in teacher education. Adult Learning, 2(6), 20-25.

Hollis, L., & Houston, W. (1991). Recruiting mature adults as teachers. Teacher Education and Practice, 6, 29-36.

Hynoski, R. (1988). Developmental teaching concerns in undergraduate teacher candidates. (Doctoral Dissertation, Miami University, 1989).

Kazelskis, R., & Reeves, C. (1987). Concern dimensions of preservice teachers. Educational Research Quarterly, 11(4), 45-52.

Lamanna, C. (1993). A study of the dimensions and the developmental progression of teachers' professional concerns. (Doctoral Dissertation, Lehigh University, 1993).

Levinson, D. (1986). A conception of adult development. American Psychologist, 41(1), 3-13.

Loevinger, J. (1976). Ego development. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Marple, D. (1989). Perspectives on student teaching: A comparative ethnographic study of traditional and nontraditional student teachers. (Doctoral Dissertation, Illinois State University, 1989).

Maxie, A. (1989, March). Student teachers' concerns and the student teaching experience: Does experience make a difference? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 308 164).

McCurdy, K. (1982). Concerns regarding teaching among students entering and exiting a teacher education program. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Idaho, 1982).

Neugarten, B. (1977). Personality and aging. In J. E. Birren and K. W. Schaie (Eds.), Handbook of the psychology of aging. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Pigge, F., & Marso, R. (1987). Relationships between student characteristics and changes in attitudes, concerns, anxieties, and confidence about teaching during teacher preparation. Journal of Educational Research, 81, 109-115.

Post, D., & Killian, J. (1992/1993). Accommodating adult students in undergraduate teacher education programs. Action in Teacher Education, 14(4), 9-15.

Schipull, D. (1990). A study of the validity and reliability of the teacher concern checklist (stress). (Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi, 1991).

Thompson, M. (1963). Identifying anxieties experienced by student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 14, 435-439.

Travers, R., Rabinowitz, W., & Nemovicher, E. (1952). The anxieties of a group of student teachers. Educational Administration and Supervision, 38, 368-375.

Table 1

ANOVA Results for the George Factors (N = 72)

Source	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*P*
	George Self Concerns (GSC)			
Time	16.43	16.43	35.24	.0001**
Groups	4.62	4.62	4.36	.04*
Interaction	.75	.75	1.62	.20
Subjects	78.44	1.06		
Error	32.65	.46		
Total	132.71			
	George Task Concerns (GTC)			
Time	.40	.40	1.70	.19
Groups	2.81	1.81	3.97	.05*
Interaction	.004	.004	.02	.89
Subjects	52.56	.72		
Error	16.83	.24		
Total	72.54			

Table 1 (Cont.)

Source	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*P*
	George Impact Concerns (GIC)			
Time	.53	.53	1.24	.26
Groups	3.46	3.46	2.48	.11
Interaction	.016	.016	0.04	.84
Subjects	103.27	1.39		
Error	30.28	.43		
Total	137.89			

Note. For time and interaction the *F* has (1,70)*df* because the model error term was used and for the groups *F* has (1,74)*df* because the subjects within the groups error term was used. $^{*}p<.05$. $^{**}p<.0001$

Table 2

ANOVA Results for the Adams et al. Factors (N = 72)

Source	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*P*
Adams et al. Self Concerns: Pupil Perceptions (ASCPP)				
Time	.448	.448	1.13	.29
Groups	2.17	2.17	2.04	.15
Interaction	.063	.063	0.16	.69
Subjects	78.70	1.06		
Error	27.90	.398		
Total	109.68			
Adams et al. Self Concerns: Adult Perceptions (ASCAP)				
Time	16.60	16.60	29.52	.0001**
Groups	3.57	3.57	2.85	.09
Interaction	1.44	1.44	2.56	.11
Subjects	92.83	1.25		
Error	39.38	.56		
Total	152.32			

Table 2 (Cont.)

Source	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*P*
Adams et al. Task Concerns: Instruction (ATCRI)				
Time	.285	.285	1.09	.30
Groups	3.44	3.44	4.69	.03*
Interaction	.072	.072	.28	.60
Subjects	54.42	.73		
Error	18.42	.26		
Total	76.60			
Adams et al. Task Concerns: Classroom Discipline (ATCRCD)				
Time	.088	.088	.23	.63
Groups	.73	.73	.59	.44
Interaction	.26	.26	.70	.40
Subjects	93.24	1.26		
Error	27.06	.38		
Total	121.87			

Table 2 (Cont.)

Source	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*P*
Adams et al. Impact Concerns: Academics (AICRA)				
Time	.53	.53	1.24	.26
Groups	3.46	3.46	2.48	.11
Interaction	.016	.016	.04	.84
Subjects	103.27	1.39		
Error	30.28	.43		
Total	137.89			
Adams et al. Impact Concerns: School Concerns (AICRSC)				
Time	1.23	1.23	2.42	.12
Groups	2.89	2.89	1.65	.20
Interaction	.02	.02	.04	.84
Subjects	130.19	1.75		
Error	35.82	.51		
Total	170.88			

Note. For time and interaction the *F* has (1,70)*df* because the model error term was used and for the groups *F* has (1,74)*df* because the subjects within error term was used.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .0001$

Table 3

ANOVA Results for the George Factors

Nontraditional Students (n = 21)

Source	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*P*
	George Self Concerns (GSC)			
Time	8.96	8.96	20.97	.0002*
Groups	.74	.74	.68	.41
Interaction	.18	.18	.43	.52
Subjects	22.77	1.08		
Error	8.12	.42		
Total	40.32			
	George Task Concerns (GTC)			
Time	.12	.12	.80	.38
Groups	2.07	2.07	3.60	.07
Interaction	.0006	.0006	.04	.83
Subjects	12.07	.57		
Error	2.85	.15		
Total	17.35			

Table 3 (Cont.)

Source	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*P*
	George Impact Concerns (GIC)			
Time	.11	.11	.55	.46
Groups	1.04	1.04	.82	.37
Interaction	.0003	.0003	.00	.96
Subjects	26.87	1.27		
Error	3.94	.20		
Total	32.10			

Note. For time and interaction the *F* has (1,19)*df* because the model error term was used and for the groups *F* has (1,21)*df* because the subjects within error term was used.

*$p<.001$

Table 4

ANOVA Results for the Adams et al. Factors

Nontraditional Students (n = 21)

Source	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*P*
Adams et al. Self Concerns: Pupil Perceptions (ASCPP)				
Time	.0002	.0002	.00	.97
Groups	.05	.05	.07	.79
Interaction	.66	.66	2.29	.14
Subjects	16.34	.77		
Error	5.54	.29		
Total	22.51			
Adams Self Concerns: Adult Perceptions (ASCAP)				
Time	10.38	10.38	21.67	.0002*
Groups	.07	.07	.07	.79
Interaction	.66	.66	1.39	.25
Subjects	23.50	1.11		
Error	9.10	.47		
Total	43.09			

Table 4

Source	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*P*
Adams Task Concerns: Instruction (ATCRI)				
Time	.15	.15	.76	.39
Groups	.90	.90	1.96	.17
Interaction	.001	.001	.01	.93
Subject	9.73	.46		
Error	3.85	.20		
Total	15.00			
Adams Task Concerns: Classroom Discipline (ATCRCD)				
Time	.16	.16	.39	.54
Groups	.89	.89	.63	.43
Interaction	.34	.34	.80	.38
Subjects	29.64	1.41		
Error	8.30	.43		
Total	39.86			

Table 4 (Cont.)

Source	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*P*
Adams Impact Concerns: Academics (AICRA)				
Time	.11	.11	.55	.46
Groups	1.04	1.04	.82	.37
Interaction	.0003	.0003	.00	.96
Subject	26.87	1.27		
Error	3.94	.20		
Total	32.10			
Adams Impact Concerns: School Concerns (AICRSC)				
Time	.21	.21	.49	.49
Groups	.43	.43	.26	.61
Interaction	.04	.04	.09	.76
Subject	34.84	1.65		
Error	8.48	.44		
Total	44.49			

Note. For time and interaction the *F* has (1,19)*df* because the model error term was used and for the groups *F* has (1,21)*df* because the subjects within group error term was used. $^{*}p<.001$

Appendix A

Concern Factors

The following was the first set of factors utilized in this study that was constructed by George (1974).

1. Concerns about self as a teacher
2. Concerns about tasks in teaching
3. Concerns about the impact of teaching on learners

The second set of factors utilized in this study was constructed by Adams et al. (1980). The following are the factors of Adams et al. (1980):

1. Self concerns about pupil perceptions.
2. Self concerns about adult perceptions.
3. Task concerns as related to instruction.
4. Task concerns as related to classroom discipline.
5. Impact concerns as related to academics.
6. Impact concerns as related to environmental influences.

Each of these individual factors is comprised of particular items on the TCC. The following are the items that correspond to the factors identified by George (1974).

<u>Self Concerns</u> -
#21 - Doing well when a supervisor is present
#46 - Feeling more adequate as a teacher
#48 - Being accepted and respected by professionals
#25 - Getting a favorable evaluation of teaching
#17 - Maintaining the appropriate degree of control

<u>Task Concerns</u> -
#12 - Lack of instructional materials
#14 - Feeling under pressure too much of the time
#29 - Working with too many students each day
#27 - Too many non-instructional duties
#15 - The routine and inflexibility of the situation

<u>Impact Concerns</u> -
#22 - Meeting the needs of different kinds of students
#24 - Diagnosing student learning problems
#30 - Challenging unmotivated students
#47 - Guiding students toward intellectual and emotional growth
#53 - Whether each student is getting what he/she needs

The following are the items on the TCC that correspond to the factors identified by Adams et al. (1980).

Self concerns -
About pupil perceptions
6 - Whether the students really like me or not
#18 - Acceptance as a friend by the students
#37 - How students feel about me
About adult perceptions
#21 - Doing well when a supervisor is present
#25 - Getting a favorable evaluation of teaching
#48 - Being accepted and respected by professionals

Task concerns -
As related to instruction
#14 - Feeling under pressure too much of the time
#15 - The routine and inflexibility of the situation
#16 - Becoming too personally involved with the students
#29 - Working with too many students each day
#43 - Lack of academic freedom

As related to classroom discipline
1 - Lack of respect of some students
#17 - Maintaining the appropriate degree of control
#31 - The values and attitudes of the current generation
#35 - Students who disrupt class

Impact concerns -
As related to academics
#22 - Meeting the needs of different kinds of students
#24 - Diagnosing student learning problems
#30 - Challenging unmotivated students
#47 - Guiding students toward intellectual/emotional growth
#53 - Whether each student is getting what he/she needs
As related to school environmental influences
#38 - Student health and nutrition problems that affect learning
#39 - The psychological climate of the school
#42 - Chronic absence and dropping out of students
#45 - Student use of drugs

Appendix B

Ethnograph Coded Response

```
      +Response from 688738                              1

      688738:  My first cooperating teacher              3
        made "room" for me in her classroom.             4
        We worked as a team and got great                5
#-AF1
        results.  I am concerned that this may           6 -#
        not be the case in my next experience.           7  |
        A new relationship must be formed.               8 -#
#-TCC41
        During my next experience I hope to              9 -#
        utilize portfolio assessment.  (if it           10  |
        is not being used already - I hope to           11  |
        start it).  I did not agree with the            12  |
        assessment and evaluation methods my            13  |
        first cooperating teacher used.  Now I          14  |
        feel I have enough background                   15  |
        knowledge to experiment with my own             16  |
$-TCC17
        technique.  I am concerned that my try          17 -#-$
        might not be a success.  Class                  18    |
        management is still a concern for me            19    |
        although I feel confident in managing           20    |
#-AF3
        a third grade classroom.  I hope that           21 -#-$
        after a fifth grade experience I will           22  |
        feel confident in managing a fifth              23  |
        grade classroom as well.  I am not as           24 -#
        timid about management and discipline           25
        as I was before my first experience.            26
```